- 1. Introductions: see attendance sheets
- 2. National Shoreline Management Study (Brian Baird): A systematic approach to sand management and identification of the levels of participation in erosion protection
 - a. Developed a mission statement, with T. McDonald, from the States perspective.
 - b. Report and recommend, to congress, on the status of shores. Including erosion and accretion and the environmental and economic impact of the changes.
 - i. Summarize existing info
 - ii. Determine Fed and Non-Fed participation levels
 - iii. General status nationally.
 - c. Recommend to use CA as a pilot
 - d. Need to kick off Workgroups including;
 - i. Shore process
 - ii. Economics
 - iii. Environmental
 - iv. Systematic management of sand
 - v. Agency roles; currently describing existing agency participation.
 - e. First questions include the
 - i. Delineation of the regions. Four coasts, Gulf of Mexico, Pacific, Atlantic and the Great Lakes.
 - ii. Consistency of data, different availability in different regions
 - f. States have the most to gain, therefore need to be the major drivers. Understanding how to get states involved is crucial and the CSMP is a good example of how to get states organizations engaged. There is large interest in how CSMW agency roles can inform national studies, short term: being an example of interagency collaboration, long term: pilot study.
- 3. Steve Sachs gave update on CCSMP workshops schedule and status.
 - a. Orange and LA counties in March, San Diego on Feb 5. (Schedule handed out).
 - b. All collaborative groups necessary to putting on workshops have been gained.
 - Public notification for San Diege was undertaken through website,
 CSMW, SANDAG and CA Coast mailing lists, two major dailies, 12 local papers.
 - i. Questions about the timeliness of the notification were raised

- ii. Questions about the location of any workshops on the central coast? Answered that this is still being contemplated but currently closest were in Ventura/Santa Barbara (Beacon) and Monterey.
- d. Logo for the CSMW letterhead for public outreach efforts needs to be designed. Suggested to use both the USACE and Resource Agency's logos in tandem.
- 4. CCSMP Mock Workshop Presentation (Steve Sachs).
 - a. Presentation with notes as meeting handout
 - b. SANDAG-(subcontractor for public involvement) will be the contact and coordinator for all info gained up and down the CA coast.
 - c. Comments
 - i. Add slide about National Study
 - ii. Add verbiage about dams as sediment traps
 - iii. Agency is working on "shoreline protection policy" this is different from this study and we need to make a distinction.
 - iv. # 72 % of bluffs.... Eroding. Source? Too strong/specific language. Does CSMP address beach erosion and accretion rather than bluffs?
 - v. 10/20 yrs beaches will disappear, too strong language. "Redistribute elsewhere" "may disappear" alternative statements
 - vi. Sediment problems needs to transition to thinking of sediment as a resource.
- 5. CCSMP Mock Workshop Presentations (Clif Davenport).
 - a. Presentation with notes as meeting handout
 - b. Comments
 - i. Inland including watershed and rivers as source of sediment.
 - ii. State law avoid hard structures
 - iii. Sought out whether to include policy or be vaguer or differentiate
 - iv. Less acronyms or define
 - v. Include mention of 2yr timeline
 - vi. Not only recreation but infrastructure, include verbiage about transportation infrastructure.
 - vii. Include workshop schedule
 - viii. Concern about inviting people to get involved in CSMW Determine level of participation,.
 - 1. Suggest Website bulletin board for general participation
 - c. Potential FAOs
 - i. Will this mean I won't be able to construct a sea wall?
 - ii. How do we get funding to gather data
 - iii. If we gather the data can we get a beach nourishment project?
 - iv. How can we, the public, participate
 - d. Peter Ruggiero: Key feature to prioritize Sediment Management needs. How do we prioritize needs and if we are to prioritize then we need

standard measurements and a consistent approach to measuring shoreline change.

6. Washington Update

- a. 1st week in March Ocean Commission Policy Report released. Here panel (agency and private) give guidance to governor so he can provide comments to the report. Only comments through governor.
- b. Presidents budget GI \$90.5 mil, CG \$1.4 bill, O&M \$1.2 bill. OMB not funding beach erosion studies, Feds no longer participate in renourishment and not fund Sec. 111. Also deauthorizing unconstructed projects to wipeout backlog.

7. USACE projects

- a. San Francisco District will prepare project list similar to LA district.
- b. LA district project list available via email.
- 8. State of CA update (Kim Sterrett); No update
- 9. Section 277
 - a. (SPL)
 - i. 100% design from APR undergoing Tech Review. (Coordinated by Lorraine loui) Schedule to meet summer construction is TOUGH but will attempt to meet it.
 - b. (SPN)
 - i. Not a lot to update, Martinez shoreline with ERDC, now developing PMP, site visit update is due. Will finalize PMP this FY.

10. RSM DEMO

- a. GIS final Deliverable, agreement with mobile for IMS.
- b. White paper on econ workshop: Risk and uncertainty
- c. Differential cost estimate for Ventura being undertaken.
- d. Next step: Prepare white paper for submarine canyons sediment transport issue.
- e. Comments
 - Need to involve Regulatory in demo projects. Good chance to do this in the Reg. Sed. Man. Watershed to harbor study at Arana Gulch (SPN)

11. Other Items/do outs

- a. Provide comments on CCSMP workshop by 3-feb.
- b. RSM newsletter article about involvement, we need to disseminate as widely as possible.
- c. Sen. Boxer interested in how language evolved for the Reg. Sed. Management. (Lynn/Susie contact this week)
- d. Provide CA schedule for National study to look at
- e. Need to resolve question about how far into the Bay/ up an estuary.
- f. Next Meeting 3rd March 9am VTC.